



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,592	10/23/2001	Mark C. Noe	PC11074A	5755
7:	590 12/18/2002			
Paul H. Ginsburg Pfizer Inc 20th Floor			EXAMINER	
			FORD, JOHN M	
235 East 42nd 8 New York, NY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1624	
			DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002	£

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/047592	
,	Examiner	Group Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet b	
Period for Response		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	S SET TO EXPIRE ON	MONTH(\$) FROM THE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) of the NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response 	ays, a response within the statute of default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered tim S from the mailing date of this communication .
Status		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
☐ This action is FINAL.		
 Since this application is in condition for allowance excaccordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 		
Disposition of Claims		
Claim(s)		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		
□ Claim(s)		
☐ Claim(s)		
		· ·
Claim(s)		is/are objected to.
		requirement.
Application Papers	•	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Dra	•	T de la companya de l
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved	□ disapproved.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob	is 🗆 approved	□ disapproved.
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 	is □ approved jected to by the Examiner.	□ disapproved.
 ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ approved jected to by the Examiner.	□ disapproved.
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are obtained. □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are obtained. □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies 	is □ approved jected to by the Examiner. r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-	(d).
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are ob □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies □ received. 	is approved piected to by the Examiner. r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)- of the priority documents ha	(d). ave been
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are obtained. □ The drawing(s) filed on is/are obtained. □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies 	is approved pjected to by the Examiner. r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)- of the priority documents ha	(d). ave been
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved pjected to by the Examiner. r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)- of the priority documents has a priority document has a priority	(d). ave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved pjected to by the Examiner. r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)- of the priority documents has a priority document has a priority	(d). ave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
 □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved pjected to by the Examiner. r. r. runder 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)- of the priority documents has been and the priority documents has been approved to be priority documents have been approv	(d). ave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved pjected to by the Examiner. r. y under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)- of the priority documents has a priority documents has a priority document. International Bureau (PCT For No(s).	(d). ave been Rule 1 7.2(a)).

Art Unit: 1624

The claims in the application are claims 1--45.

This application has been found to contain more than one invention. Therefore, restriction to one of the following distinct inventions is required:

- (I) The instances in claims 1--42 where variable A is subspecies a, b, d, g, j, m, n and o; five membered rings.
- (II) The instances in claims 1 --42 where variable A is sub-species e, h and k; the six membered rings.
- (III) The instances in claims 1--42 where variable A is sub-genus c, f, \vec{i} and l; the seven

membered rings.

(IV) Claims 43--45 drawn to multiple methods of use.

Claim 1 constitutes an improper joinder of inventions as it groups together species inventions that are distinct and separately classified, and will support separate patents. Ex parte the Variables were Markush, 1925 C.D. 126, provided for this claim structure were "so closely related that they would not support a series of patents". This is not the case here. Therefore, the instant generic claims constitute an improper joinder of inventions; Ex parte Reid, 105 U.S.P.Q. 251; In re Winnek, 73 U.S.P.Q. 225; In re Ruzicka, 66 U.S.P.Q. 226.

Claim 1 is extremely burdensome due to the A variables a)--o) as each is a distinct invention that will support separate patents; in that a reference for one would not be a reference for the other(s). All of the A variables cannot be examined in the limited time provided.

Application/Control Number: 10/047,592 Page 3

Art Unit: 1624

Therefore, 37 CFR 1.141(a) provides for one invention per application. Some method of restricting must be arrived at. The size of the A ring has been choosen, at it produces patentably distinct variations that will support separate patents.

These distinct inventions have acquired separate status in the art, will support separate patents, and will require different fields of search for the respective inventions. Accordingly, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is considered proper; 35 U.S.C. 121; 37 CFR 1.141 and 37 CFR 1.142.

M.P.E.P. 806.05 (h) provides for restricting claims 43--45, out where it can be demonstrated that the compounds of claim 1 may be used for more than one purpose. Claims 43--45 become evidence claims to that allegation.

If Group IV is elected a further election of one specific utility is required flaim 45 is not one specific utility, and does not meet the real world of Commerce test, as it is a laboratory test.

Applicants' response must include a provisional election, even if the requirement be traversed, see 37 CFR 1.143 and 37 CFR 1.144.

John M. Ford:jmr

December 16, 2002